

Meeting Minutes

CCN: 061054

Job No. 22192

Written Response Required? NO

Due Date: N/A

Actionee: N/A

Closes CCN: N/A

OU: GW/VZ100

TSD: N/A

ERA: N/A

Subject Code: 4170; 8830/4170

SUBJECT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT WEEKLY MEETING - AUGUST 17, 1998

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, GW/VZ Project Manager

DATE August 20, 1998

ATTENDEES

See Attached Distribution List

DISTRIBUTION

Attendees

See Attached Distribution List

Document and Info Services H0-09

NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT WEEKLY MEETING:

Date: August 24, 1998

Location: PNNL Environmental Technology Building (ETB), Columbia River Room

Local Call In Number: (509) 376-7411

Toll Free Call In Number: (800) 664-0771

MEETING MINUTES:

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Weekly Meeting was held on August 17, 1998, in Richland, Washington, at PNNL ETB, Columbia River Room.

PROJECT REPORT:

FUNDING:

The GW/VZ Project needs to identify the necessary funding for FY99 to accomplish its mission. There are activities going on at DOE-RL in terms of the priority process, the Site Management Board went through a review this morning to determine what was in and what was out for the current year. Rich Holten is going to weigh in with a request for additional funds for this project from the \$10M discussed last week. Linda Bauer will be contacting Jackson Kinser regarding this matter. Right now, when you add everything up, the Project has a \$30M total. It is anticipated that to move forward aggressively, this project will require another \$10M.

QUESTION: Regarding funding, it would be significant to hear a few more words on what the \$30M means in respect to the GW/VZ and/or the various other site activities related to the GW/VZ. In the same context, which project is supporting activities which are central to the GW/VZ. In light of that, where does the \$10M fall?

RESPONSE: Some of that was covered last week, roughly, remediation includes \$6-7M for pump and treats to keep the current RODs moving; groundwater monitoring, with groundwater modeling, includes

061054.WPD

\$11-12M; integration activities have at least \$2M; David Shafer and TWRS has \$4.8M and then there are a couple of smaller dollars amounts. The \$30M does not count anything in HTI and ILAW. Right now, the Project is trying to determine what we would do with an additional \$10M. Rich Holten is trying to set-up meetings with Ecology and EPA to receive their input and determine where they are at. It is important to do what we can to have a good program. On the top of our list for the \$10M is to move out with additional characterization in the 200 Area; begin work on the conceptual model, develop the system assessment capability; and have additional river work.

COMMENT: The point I want to make sure was put at the front of our thought processes is the need for an effects assessment, which is hopefully becoming the core of the GW/VZ Project. Just the system assessment will take 3 years to obtain good answers, preliminary answers will take 1-2 years and would cost between \$4-6M. If that is not funded, then we need to do some serious talking.

RESPONSE: The National Laboratory efforts will be meeting some of these needs.

COMMENT: If we don't have the focus of an effects assessment, then we don't have the right focus.

RESPONSE: The Project isn't planned beyond FY99. The plan is to have the Long Range Plan completed by December.

QUESTION: What is the plan for involving core activities?

RESPONSE: DOE-RL will be talking with Ecology and EPA before Wednesday to discuss what we have planned right now. What is available is a sheet of paper with \$10M and some broad ideas for scope. At the meetings that will be scheduled you will have an opportunity to provide input.

QUESTION: I have a concern as to the budget authority of this Project regarding the integration concept. The way I see it right now, the integration effort has been a failure because it doesn't now manage the groups and there are no changes to what is being done. (i.e AX Farm Characterization with Cone Penetrometer and TWRS which isn't integrated among itself let alone this organization). The question ultimately is the budget -- which is the hammer you can use to integrate this stuff. So the question is, what is the budget authority of this group?

ANSWER: Like any other project, authority is given by the Site Management Board. What this Project has is the ability to weigh-in on other projects, normally projects do not have that input. This Project's authority is whether to concur or not concur on what the other projects are planning. If it doesn't concur we then lay out a case of why it isn't acceptable.

QUESTION: What authority does this Project have to take the \$1M for the AX Characterization Work being done this year and use it for something productive?

ANSWER: We only have the authority, or ability, to go to the Site Management Board with a recommendation.

QUESTION: So this group does not have the authority?

- ANSWER: Only one group on site has the authority to move money around and that is the Site Management Board.
- QUESTION: So what you are saying is that the Site Management Board has not given this Project vadose zone budget authority?
- ANSWER: Once a decision has been made on what budget this Project will receive, then we have the authority to determine how it will be spent.
- COMMENT: As stated before in other meetings, the train has already left the station a long time ago. The projects are doing things that they aren't sure are the right things to do. Because the assessment hasn't been done, even if the Integration Project had the authority, they wouldn't know what to spend the money on until they complete the system assessment.
- RESPONSE: We have the ability to make judgements, one that we know is that the TWRS budget of \$4.8 is not enough. How much is enough? We know we need to hit the 200E and 200W sites, and that is the level of detail we have. TWRS will not commit to their budget until December. They will be operating from a letter of agreement rather than signing a DWP. This project can't make a judgement on what the other programs are doing until we see their plans and know where they are headed. Once we have that information we will be in a position to make a judgement.
- COMMENT: Until you have a system assessment any budgeting is still guess work.
- RESPONSE: We need a Long Range Plan tying into the milestones and that is scheduled for December.
- COMMENT: At some point you have a system assessment that will tell you that you need to have certain assessments done.
- RESPONSE: A combination of the system assessment and a timeframe of when you need it done. A determination of what is the next big decision point.
- COMMENT: Knowing that everything right now is somewhat disorganized, the concern is why are the other projects continuing forward with their programs when there isn't a master plan in place, the system assessment and Long Range Plan? That should be the first thing done through this Project so that money won't be misspent. Maybe until an effective plan is in place the other projects could hold off on funding until things are properly managed by an integration plan. If we could do that, maybe we would determine that we have enough money.
- RESPONSE: DOE-RL believes that the funding is short. The GW/VZ Project plan is that we are not in a position to fully affect decision until next year. Without a Long Range Plan how can the Project agree to X before Y. You can't effectively argue your position without it. We will have the first cut of the Long Range Plan by December. Without it we are in a weak position to argue this year. What we will ask for is the ability to make judgements.
- COMMENT: At this point you can't make a great case to cleanup K-Basin. Hanford is operating on gut feelings. But, they are highly educated gut feelings and there is a high probability that most of the work going on at Hanford will not be wasted efforts.

RESPONSE: There is always professional judgement on what gets funded.

COMMENT: Then when all is said and done, if the public isn't happy with the activities and decisions made, we have lost time. I doubt every dollar will be spent as efficiently as it could be. Also, there is no guarantee that the model will make everything productive from there on out.

RESPONSE: It isn't an issue of stopping everything until the model is done. If you look at this Project with the conclusion that it has no authority over the other projects, even without the model, when you look at the site as a whole system, you might do some things differently.

This Project's authority is to do things by exception. If the Project Management Plan goes forward, DOE has the authority from John Wagoner to concur or non-concur on other budgets.

One of the critical items is that if we are going to be successful, then the appropriate level of authority needs to be there. How it is managed can be several ways. We have discussed whether the other work should come straight over to this Project. The conclusion is that these other projects have activities that are vital to the project management and if this Project carves them away it takes away the authority they have to do work. That may not be the right way to do things from a project management view.

There are two ways to configure the GW/VZ Project. Option A: would be to transfer all groundwater/vadose zone work to the GW/VZ Project for management. Option B: would be that all related groundwater/vadose zone workscope would be reviewed and managed through the Change Control process and the Site Management Board.

Option B is the way that the GW/VZ Project is currently configured. New work being done under the site projects is assessment work and we will need \$5-6M per year over the next three years for assessment work. To date, the \$2M funding scenario for FY99 will not be adequate for assessment.

QUESTION: What will a \$5-6M budget buy?

ANSWER: It will not support new data collection.

MISSION:

We would like to readdress the mission statement. In last week's HAB-ER Committee Meeting we committed to rewrite the mission statement. What we have attached to today's agenda are four versions. The first is the mission statement and objectives as they currently appear in the Project Specification Document. The second is a revision by Tom Woods. The third is a few minor edits of Tom Woods version which were given by Marty Bensky. Last, we took Tom's version down to our Technical Editing Department this morning and requested that they do a technical review of the mission statement, which is standard procedure at Bechtel. With a quick review, I can see right now that the first sentence isn't a complete sentence, but we would like to gain a consensus on this mission statement today.

COMMENT: If you really want a mission statement that captures several concepts or ideas then it will need to be a long sentence, otherwise it doesn't have the clarifying statements needed.

COMMENT: The project won't be making remediation decisions, to ensure that the decisions are defensible is not the scope of this Project.

RESPONSE: I disagree, the mission of the project is to ensure that the technical basis is there to have good decisions.

COMMENT: I agree with the word ensure, but what you are ensuring needs to be defined.

COMMENT: I don't think going with ensure causes problems.

COMMENT: Site decisions is too broad, there needs to be a single word modifier in front of decisions.

RESPONSE: Is cleanup decisions okay?

COMMENT: Yes.

QUESTION: Tom, what is meant by the statement: "to assess the Hanford Site's present (and post-closure) cumulative effects?"

ANSWER: Hanford may be the recipient of other wastes from other sites. We need to be able to include/capture those. In other words, inventory of waste at Hanford isn't just that which is here on August 17, 1998. We need to be able to include what it is as well as what it is expected to be.

COMMENT: Tom, in the last sentence, I would like to strike the phrase "pursued by the national laboratories" since there may be other universities and organizations involved.

RESPONSE: I wouldn't quarrel with that, Mike and Rich can define how they want to capture.

RESPONSE: How about if we state assessment and cleanup?

COMMENT: If you include assessment and cleanup in the mission then you don't need the STCG anymore.

RESPONSE: This project is broader than assessment, but it is fuzzy in terms of the other institutions that exist. This project could be a provider to the STCG on Science and Technology needs, so I don't see a particular conflict.

COMMENT: When thinking around mission lines, assessment, then cleanup and disposal. I think the STCG is only involved in assessment and they don't get involved in the rest.

RESPONSE: To clarify, when you say assessment it includes characterization?

COMMENT: Yes.

COMMENT: Take out assessment and say enable the successful completion.

RESPONSE: I think we have a clear understanding of what is needed here. We will rewrite and share the revised mission.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT:

The public comment period for the Tribal Nations and Public Consultation Plan comes to an end on Friday. We are still hoping to get some written comments from Tom Woods and Ecology. Please put anything down that you would like to share in writing. We will prepare a responsiveness summary on the comments received, which will show how we addressed them. This summary will be completed by the end of the year.

We are getting ready to send out a letter asking for feedback on our communications process. It will include a questionnaire that will solicit input on the level of communication. Do you want to continue to receive information as you currently do, or is there some other level of communication you would prefer. Also, we will be asking about the meeting minutes. We have comments from people saying, "Why are you killing me with all this paper?" and other people have responded with, "The level of detail is just what I'm looking for." We are trying to get a better handle on the level of detail desired.

As has been mentioned earlier, we are scheduling appointments to have some one-on-one meetings. We will be making appointments to stop by and see Ecology and EPA about the budget scenarios, as well as get their perspective on other parts of the Project. For individuals, we could meet after next Monday's meeting. We would also like to meet with the Tribal Nations, if that is okay with Tom Woods and Wade Riggsbee. (Response: Yes). We will go outside the Tri-Cities as well. Dirk, Mike Thompson will be calling to set something up for Thursday. We will try to combine that with some meetings with other organizations/individuals along the way (Greg deBruler, Paige Knight) and will be meeting with Shelley Cimon next week.

QUESTION: For the public involvement forums this fall, which are now in November, will they be outlined and created by DOE or will the other groups have a role setting up the agendas?

ANSWER: Yes, they will play an important role in preparing the times and agenda. It is because of initial feedback that the forums have been postponed until November, September was a bad timeframe

EXPERT PANEL:

Attached to today's agenda is the Expert Panel Protocol we have shared many times, in different versions, in the past. One thing that the protocol calls for is rotation of a chair for the panel and that the first chair would be selected by DOE-RL. Before we move out on that, we wanted to see if there is any concern with proceeding to select a chair for the panel. Is there an issue with DOE-RL selecting or is there a better way? One of our concerns is that with eight people on the panel it will make it more difficult to get all parties together. If we go ahead and select the chair, then we can work with him to be more expedient in getting things off the ground.

QUESTION: What is the role of the chair to the other members?

ANSWER: There is some management and execution to prepare for meetings. We will also have a point of contact regarding deliverables.

COMMENT: Is there a consensus among the panel members? If you don't get a response from the panel members, then name one.

RESPONSE: The problem is that it has taken so long to name the panel members and get together that we would like to proceed as quickly as possible.

COMMENT: The factor of selecting a chair may not be any more important than who has the greatest availability.

COMMENT: My vote would be Wierenga.

RESPONSE: So what we are hearing is that this isn't an issue and we can move ahead and have DOE-RL select a chair.

COMMENT: On the panel protocol you have something on the process of selecting sub-panels. It states that the board group would be picking the sub panel and yet you have said that you were going to select a groundwater panel. That doesn't follow the protocol.

RESPONSE: As addressed in our last meeting, we explained that because the expert panel hadn't yet been named, and there was a need for a groundwater sub-panel to meet a project commitment, that with the agreement of this group, the groundwater panel would be selected by the chief hydrologist for Bechtel National. However, it now looks like the groundwater panel will go into next year and the GW/VZ Expert Panel will be able to make the selection.

COMMENT: I think it would be a good idea to involve Bechtel's chief hydrologist as part of the sub-panel. People at that level usually have years of experience and knowledge.

LONG RANGE PLAN:

We would like to get together a small group to begin working on the Long Range Plan, which is a series of tasks that support decisions. If anyone has some energy and would like to participate in this process please give Michael Graham a call (509-372-9179).

NATIONAL LAB MEETINGS:

There are National Laboratory Meetings scheduled for next week, August 25-26, the agenda is attached. If you have any comments please give Michael Graham, (509-372-9179), Shirley Rawson (509-376-0223) or Tom Page (509-372-9482) a call.

QUESTION: I picked up a copy of the detailed meeting meetings from the National Lab Meetings in July and didn't see a list of the Science and Technology needs identified by each of the groups. Can I get a copy of that list?

ACTION: Provide a list of the S&T needs identified by the groups to Dib Goswami and Dirk Dunning.

COMMENT: I didn't see anything on risk.

RESPONSE: Risk and Monitoring will be addressed in the next fiscal year.

COMMENT: We need to develop sensitivity that we may be pointing in a direction that we won't know is okay until the people estimate the impact.

RESPONSE: Yes, we will need to loop back. Things will not be launched until they have been reconciled.

6-WEEK LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR:

Attached also is the 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar that assists in keeping track of the activities related to this project.

COMMENT: On the Nevada Workshop in September, in order to know if we should attend we need to understand what is the level of involvement that Hanford is putting into this workshop.

RESPONSE: There are two meetings going on back-to-back. First there is a meeting regarding the vadose zone knowledge book that is being prepared. That will happen the first two days. On Wednesday and Thursday there will be meetings bringing together the arid states to see what is happening at other DOE sites. They are looking at closing some Nevada low level waste disposal cells. I believe that the regulators, stakeholders and DOE are on board.

QUESTION: What do you know about a meeting on the September 29-30 in Las Vegas dealing with tanks?

ANSWER: I'm not aware of that meeting.

COMMENT: You can contact Kathy Howard at 803-649-7963 extension 315 for further information.

Lastly, regarding the CRCIA White Paper, Tony is waiting for comments from Tom Woods. When do you think you will be able to get this to Tony?

ANSWER: Probably by tomorrow, certainly by the end of the week.

COMMENT: I would just like to make a final comment on Dru's public involvement plan. What she is tracking is not a public involvement plan, it is trying to find a solution to a credibility problem. She has to find a way to put together the right kind of participation and management so that when all is said and done it is technically defensible and publicly acceptable. This is much more than your typical public involvement plan and that will be the direction of our comments.

NOTE:

Groundwater/Vadose Zone Web Site Location: <http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose>

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1) National Laboratory Meeting Agenda, August 25-26
- 2) Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project Mission - Draft statements
- 3) 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar

ATTENDEES:

Marty Bensky, HAB
John Brodeur, Mactech-ER
Bob Bryce, PNNL
Dru Butler, BHI
John Clark, JAI Corp.
Dirk Dunning, Oregon Ecology
Dib Goswami, Ecology
Michael Graham, BHI
Rich Holten, DOE-RL
Fred Mann, FDNW

Katy McKeig,
Tom Page, PNNL
Tom Post, EPA
Wade Riggsbee, YIN
David Shafer, DOE-RL
Karen Strickland, BHI
Tom Wintczak, BHI
Thomas W. Woods, YIN

ATTACHMENT 1

NATIONAL LABORATORY TECHNICAL MEETING

AUGUST 25-26, 1998

8:00 a.m.- 5:00 p.m.

LOCATION: Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory
Conference Room 1077
3335 Q Avenue
Richland, WA 99352

PURPOSE: Continue the development of science and technology initiatives for new work to further understanding of contaminant mobility at Hanford. Incorporate planning into preliminary S/T roadmaps.

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

- Complete gap analyses for groundwater and inventory technical program elements. Gain information on programmatic drivers and other S/T gaps through presentations by Hanford programs. Develop science and technology initiatives to address key issues and gaps. Time permitting, begin drafting of preliminary roadmaps.
- Finalize existing descriptions of science and technology initiatives for the vadose zone geohydrology and geochemistry and river technical program elements. Develop preliminary roadmaps that connect initiatives to site needs.

TUESDAY, AUGUST 25

8:00 a.m. – 8:20 a.m.	Welcome/Introductions
8:20 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.	S/T Plan for the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project
9:30 a.m.	Move into Parallel Break Out Sessions
9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Groundwater/Inventory Presentations on Programmatic Drivers and Plans of Other Hanford Projects for New Work
9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Vadose zone, geochemistry, river Background Material on Sites Targeted
12:30 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.	LUNCH
1:30 p.m. – 2:15 p.m.	Guidance on Development of S/T Roadmaps
2:15 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Breakout Sessions
5:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.	All Reconvene to Main Room to Assess Progress

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 26

8:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.	Breakout Sessions
10:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.	Break
10:15 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.	Continue Breakout Sessions and Summarize Findings for Presentation to All
1:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.	LUNCH
1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	Breakout Session Reports to All Participants
3:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.	Public Comment
3:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	Next Steps/Actions
4:00 p.m.	Adjourn

BREAKOUT SESSIONS:

Tuesday: Four sessions will be held. Two sessions will be held to complete the description of S/T initiatives:

- Columbia River
- Vadose Zone Geohydrology and Geochemistry

Two sessions will be held to conduct gaps analysis and draft initial S/T initiatives:

- Groundwater
- Inventory

Purpose of Vadose Zone Geohydrology and Geochemistry sessions—Finish discussions of research at possible field sites on the 200 plateau. Outline initiatives for three – five years of research.

Purpose of Groundwater and Inventory Sessions— Identify important programmatic drivers and assess work proposed by Hanford projects. Identify areas for new work (consider both the 200 plateau and near the river). Outline technical approach to new work that can be conducted over a three – five year period.

Wednesday: Four sessions will be held. Two of those sessions will develop preliminary roadmaps:

- Columbia River
- Vadose Zone Geohydrology and Geochemistry

Two of those sessions will complete drafting science initiatives and put together preliminary roadmaps:

- Groundwater
- Inventory

Purpose of Vadose Zone Geohydrology and Geochemistry sessions—Develop roadmaps based on previously identified issues, approaches, proposed science and technology initiatives, and site needs.

Purpose of Groundwater and Inventory sessions—Finish discussions of research at possible field sites. Outline initiatives for three – five years of research. Develop roadmaps based on previously identified issues, approaches, proposed science and technology initiatives, and site needs.

NATIONAL LABORATORY TECHNICAL MEETING
JUNE 24-25, 1998

Expected Participants List:

Bechtel Hanford, Inc.

Mike Graham

Pam Doctor

Bruce Ford

Tony Knepp

Ch2MHill

Bob Peterson

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Terry C. Hazen

Donald J. DePaolo

Eric Sonnenthal

April L. James

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

Kenneth C. Jackson

Charles Carrigan

Susan Carroll

Los Alamos National Laboratory

Sandy Wagner

Orrin Myers

Everett P. Springer

Arend Meijer

Oak Ridge National Laboratory

Thomas Early

Dan Jones

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

Charlie Brandt

Roger Dirkes

Dave Dixon

Mark Freshley

Glendon Gee

Roy Gephart

Vern Johnson

Charley Kincaid

Phil Long

Tom Page

Marilyn Quadrel

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory Continued

Shirley Rawson

Jeff Serne

John Zachara

Sandia National Laboratory

George C. Allen

Suggested Participation in Breakout Groups Based on Previous Meeting and Expressions of Interest:

Columbia River

Tony Knepp

Bob Peterson

Terry Hazen

April James

Dan Jones

Orrin Myers

Sandy Wagner

Charlie Brandt

Vern Johnson

Roger Dirkes

Vadose Zone Biogeochemistry

Ken Jackson

Susan Carroll

Arend Meijer

Jeff Serne

John Zachara

Vadose Zone Geohydrology:

Don DePaolo

Glendon Gee

Charley Kincaid

Tom Early

Charles Carrigan

Everett Springer

ATTACHMENT 2

GROUNDWATER/VADOSE ZONE INTEGRATION PROJECT MISSION

PROJECT SPECIFICATION DOCUMENT:

Mission:

The mission of the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project is to ensure that Hanford Site decisions are defensible and possess an integrated perspective for the protection of water resources, the Columbia River environment, river-dependent life, and users of the Columbia River resources.

Objectives:

- Coordinate and align technical work towards common goals that result in protection of water resources.
- Develop assessment methods for human health and ecological risk that support all cleanup decisions.
- Evaluate the sustainability of groundwater resources and the river ecosystem, the cultural quality of life, and socioeconomic impacts over the period of time that Hanford-derived contaminants remain intrinsically hazardous.
- Instill a sound technical basis for Hanford Site cleanup decisions through the use of applied science and technology.
- Provide a means for making sound and consistent management decisions throughout all affected Hanford Site programs.
- Be open and responsive to the regulators, stakeholders, the public, and Tribal Nations.

TOM WOODS:

To ensure that Hanford Site decisions are defensible and possess an integrated perspective for the protection of water resources, the Columbia River environment, river-dependent life, and users of Columbia River resources, the mission of the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project is to assess the Site's present and post-closure cumulative effects of the radioactive and chemical materials which have accumulated throughout Hanford's history and continued to be received. To enable this mission the GW/VZ Project will also define those actions necessary to bring into consistency – and maintain mutual compatibility amount – Sitewide characterization and analysis tasks that bear on decisions affecting cleanup operations, planned and achieved waste disposal isolation performance, receptor impact, and regulatory compliance. The GW/VZ Project will identify and oversee the science and technology initiatives pursued by the national laboratories as necessary to enable the assessment mission to be successfully completed.

MARTY BENSKY:

To ~~ensure that~~ **support** Hanford Site decisions ~~are defensible and possess an integrated perspective~~ for the protection of water resources, the Columbia River environment, river-dependent life, and users of Columbia River resources, the mission of the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project is to **provide a defensible assessment of** the Site's present and post-closure cumulative effects of the radioactive and chemical materials which have accumulated throughout Hanford's history and continued to be received. To enable this mission the GW/VZ Project will also define those actions necessary to bring into consistency – and maintain mutual compatibility amount – Sitewide characterization and analysis tasks that bear on decisions affecting cleanup operations, planned and achieved waste disposal isolation performance, receptor impact, and regulatory compliance. The GW/VZ Project will identify and oversee the science and technology initiatives pursued by the national laboratories as necessary to enable the assessment mission to be successfully completed.

CHRIS FORBES TECHNICAL EDIT:

To ensure that Hanford Site decisions are defensible, and that these decisions present an integrated perspective for the protection of water resources, the Columbia River environment, river-dependent life, and users of Columbia River resources. The mission of the Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project is to assess the Hanford Site's present (and post-closure) cumulative effects in terms of the radioactive and chemical materials that have accumulated throughout Hanford's history. To support this mission the GW/VZ Project will define those actions that will result in consistent and compatible site-wide characterization and analysis tasks, particularly those tasks that affect cleanup operations, planned and achieved waste disposal isolation performance, receptor impact, and regulatory compliance. The GW/VZ Project will identify and oversee those national laboratory science and technology initiatives that enable successful completion of the GW/VZ Project mission.

ATTACHMENT 3

6-WEEK LOOK AHEAD
AUGUST 14, 1998 – SEPTEMBER 25, 1998
GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT

<i>July 8 to August 21</i>	Public Comment Period for the Draft GW/VZ Tribal Government and Public Consultation Plan Document
<i>August 3 to September 4</i>	Review of the Draft Project Specification Document
<i>August 17</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. – PNNL Columbia River Room
<i>August 24</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. – PNNL Columbia River Room
<i>August 25-26</i>	National Lab Meetings – 8:00 to 5:00 p.m. All Modules B Richland, Washington B PNNL Environmental Molecular Sciences Lab, Assembly Room, 3335 Q Ave.
<i>August 31</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. – PNNL Columbia River Room
<i>September 24-25</i>	Nevada Vadose Zone Monitoring Workshop (Sponsored by DOE Nevada Operations) Las Vegas, NV

GW/VZ Integration Project Distribution List

Associated Western Universities, Inc.

Ruth Ann Kirk kirk_ra@awu.org

Bechtel Hanford, Inc.

D. H. Butler cc:Mail
 R. L. Dale cc:Mail
 P. G. Doctor cc:Mail
 S. C. Foelber cc:Mail
 B. H. Ford cc:Mail
 O. T. Goodman cc:Mail
 M. J. Graham cc:Mail
 M. C. Hughes cc:Mail
 G. F. Jones cc:Mail
 R. Jundt cc:Mail
 A. J. Knepp cc:Mail
 B. S. Kuntz cc:Mail
 S. D. Liedle cc:Mail
 N. B. Myers cc:Mail
 K. H. Strickland cc:Mail
 T. M. Wintczak cc:Mail

Benton-Franklin Public Health

Margery Swint Fax: 375-5750

Bureau of Land Management

Jake Jakabosky jjakabos@sc0126wp.sc.blm.gov

Central WA Building Trades Council

Richard Berglund Fax: 547-2139

City of Pasco

Charles Kilbury Fax: 545-3403

City of Richland

Pam Brown Fax: 942-7379
 Jill Monley Fax: 942-7379

City of West Richland

Jerry Peltier cc:Mail

Columbia River United

Greg deBruler cruwa@gorge.net

CRESP

John Abbotts abbotts@u.washington.edu
 Tim Ewers tewers@moscow.com
 D. Mercer dmerc@u.washington.edu

Critique

Mary K. Campbell cc:Mail

DOE-Headquarters

R. Alvarez robert.alvarez@hq.doe.gov
 J. D. Berwick jberwick@doegipo.com
 H. W. Calley harry.calley@em.doe.gov
 M. K. Harmon cc:Mail

DOE-Headquarters Continued

W. M. Levitan william.levitan@em.doe.gov
 E. Livingston ellen.livingston@hq.doe.gov

DOE-RL

S. L. Alt cc:Mail
 L. K. Bauer cc:Mail
 D. H. Chapin cc:Mail
 S. S. Clark cc:Mail
 K. V. Clarke cc:Mail
 B. L. Foley cc:Mail
 J. B. Hall cc:Mail
 J. P. Hanson cc:Mail
 R. D. Hildebrand cc:Mail
 R. A. Holten cc:Mail
 C. S. Louie cc:Mail
 G. M. McClure cc:Mail
 D. E. Olson cc:Mail
 M. J. Plahuta cc:Mail
 K. K. Randolph cc:Mail
 D. S. Shafer cc:Mail
 M. I. Talbot cc:Mail
 D. K. Tano cc:Mail
 K. M. Thompson cc:Mail
 A. C. Tortoso cc:Mail
 J. K. Yerxa cc:Mail
 J. H. Zeisloft cc:Mail

ECO Associate

J. S. Lewinsohn cc:Mail

EnviroIssues

Holly Delaney envissue@halcyon.com
 Louise Dressen envissue@halcyon.com
 Jennifer Kauffman envissue@halcyon.com

Environmental Management Advisory Board

J. T. Melillo james.melillo@em.doe.gov
 M. R. Pfister mike.pfister@hq.doe.gov

Fluor Daniel Hanford

Janice D. Williams cc:Mail

Framatome

Rex Robinson send hard copy

Freestone Environmental Services

Daniel K. Tyler cc:Mail

General Public

Marilyn Anderson marnhar@3-cities.com
Joe Caggiano caggja@gte.net
Dr. Rob Drury hermes@owt.com
Chester Huang ulft77a@prodigy.com
Glenn Russcher send hard copy

Government Accountability Project

Pamela Burton jjs1@jps.net
Tom Carpenter gap@whistleblower.org

Government Accounting Office

Chris Abraham cc:Mail

Grant & Franklin Counties

Jack Yorgesen Fax: 1-509-932-4306

HAB's Hanford Work Force Nonunion/ Nonmanagement Employees

Madeleine Brown cc:Mail
Susan Leckband Fax: 372-2303
Jeff Luke cc:Mail
Wayne Martin cc:Mail

HAB's Public-at-Large

Martin Bensky send hard copy
Gordon Rogers send hard copy

Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council

Jim Watts cc:Mail

Hanford Environmental Action League

Todd Martin Fax: 1-509-326-2932

Hanford Watch of Oregon

Robin Klein Fax: 1-503-736-0097
Paige Knight Fax: 1-503-287-6329

Heart of America Northwest

Gerald Pollet Fax: 1-206-382-1148
Page Leven Fax: 1-206-382-1148

ICF Kaiser Consulting Group

Barry Moravek BMoravek@icfkaiser.com

In Situ Technologies, Inc.

Randy Price r4mprice@3-cities.com

Jacobs Engineering

Lynne Roeder-Smith cc:Mail

JAI Corporation

Don Clark donclark@gte.net

KEPR Television

Peter Michaels Fax: 547-5365

Local Business Interests

Dave Watrous cc:Mail

Lower Columbia Basin Audobon Society

Rick Leamont leamont@owt.com

MacTec-ERS

Jim Bertsch Jill_M_Meinecke@rl.gov
John Brodeur Jill_M_Meinecke@rl.gov

Numatec Hanford

Jerry Davis cc:Mail

Oregon Hanford Waste Board

Shelley Cimon Fax: 1-541-963-0853

Oregon Office of Energy

Mary Lou Blazek Fax: 1-503-373-7806
Dirk Dunning dirk.a.dunning@state.or.us
Mike Grainey Fax: 1-503-373-7806
Doug Huston Fax: 1-503-373-7806
Steve Sautter steven.p.sautter@state.or.us

Other Place Ranch

Louis Hamilton othrplcrh@aol.com

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

Marcel P. Bergeron cc:Mail
Robert W. Bryce cc:Mail
Charles T. Kincaid cc:Mail
Phil E. Long cc:Mail
Bruce A. Napier cc:Mail
Thomas L. Page cc:Mail
Marilyn J. Quadrel cc:Mail
Shirley A. Rawson cc:Mail
R. Jeff Serne cc:Mail
Terri L. Stewart cc:Mail
Barbara K. Wise cc:Mail

Pacific Rim Enterprise Center

Vince Panesko vince@owt.com

Port of Benton

Robert Larson Fax: 375-6008

Systematic Management Service, Inc.

Katy Makeig makeig@erols.com

Tri-Cities Visitor & Convention Bureau

Kris Watkins 783-9005

Tri-City Herald

John Stang Fax: 582-1510

Tri-Cities Development & Economic Council

Dick Greenberg Fax: 735-6609

Harold Heacock Fax: 735-6609

Sam Volpentest Fax: 735-6609

TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla

Indian Reservation

Stuart Harris Fax: 1-541-278-5380

Armand Minthorn Fax: 1-541-278-5380

Joe Richards Rjoey@ix.netcom.com

J. R. Wilkinson jrww@ucinet.com

Nez Perce Tribe

Dan Landeen Fax: 1-208-843-7378

Donna Powauke Fax: 1-208-843-7378

Stan Sobczyk stans@nezperce.org

John Stanfill johns@nezperce.org

Wanapaum Tribe

Rex Buck rbuck@gcpud.org

Brent Lenz blenz@gcpud.org

Yakama Indian Nation

Barbara Harper bharper@nwinfo.net

Russell Jim Fax: 1-509-452-2503

Lino Niccoli Fax: 943-8555

Wade Riggsbee riggsbee@3-cities.com

Thomas W. Woods Fax: 943-8555

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Craig Cameron send hard copy to B5-01

Larry Gadbois cc:Mail

Dennis A. Faulk cc:Mail

Tom Post cc:Mail

Doug Sherwood cc:Mail

UC National Labs

Sandra Wagner swagner@lanl.gov

UFA Ventures, Inc., WSU Tri-Cities

Jim Conca Fax: 375-7451

Joseph Mockler Fax: 375-7451

University of Washington

Thomas Engel Fax: 1-206-685-8665

WA State Department of Ecology

Steve Alexander cc:Mail

Suzanne Dahl-Crumpler cc:Mail

Damon Delistraty ddel461@ecy.wa.gov

Jack W. Donnelly cc:Mail

Dib Goswami cc:Mail

Dave Holland cc:Mail

Stan Leja cc:Mail

Zelma Maine cc:Mail

Scott McKinney cc:Mail

Douglas Palenshus cc:Mail

Valarie Peery cc:Mail

Max Power cc:Mail

Casey Ruud cc:Mail

Ron Skinnarland cc:Mail

Phillip R. Staats cc:Mail

Geoff Tallent cc:Mail

Michael Turner cc:Mail

Mike Wilson cc:Mail

WA State Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jay McConaughy Fax: 736-3030

WA State Department of Health

Nancy Darling ned0303@hub.doh.wa.gov

Debra McBaugh Fax: 1-360-236-2255

Washington League of Women Voters

Elizabeth Tabbutt Fax: 1-360-956-9287

Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility

Ruth Yarrow psrwase@igc.apc.org

Washington State University

James Cochran Fax: 372-7354

Waste Management Northwest

Don Moak cc:Mail